



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,497	08/05/2003	Martin Grohman	34192	8665

7590 03/01/2006

Hovey Williams LLP
Suite 400
2405 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108

EXAMINER

SLACK, NAKO N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3635

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/634,497		GROHMAN, MARTIN	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Naoko Slack		3635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

In view of applicant's amendment received December 15, 2005, amendments to the specification and claims have been entered. New claims 17-23 have been entered. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but are not convincing in view of the new rejection necessitated by amendment. Examination of pending claims 1-23 is herein presented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 7, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by US Patent Application Publication 2003/0123924 to Eberle, III.

Claim 1:

Eberle III discloses a deck board comprising an elongated body presenting a pair of similarly configured sides, each of the sides including a normally-upper lip (61) and a normally-lower lip (63), each of the sides including a longitudinal groove (55) defined between the normally-upper lip and the normally-lower lip, the groove including an inner-most surface representing the deepest portion of the groove, the normally-upper

Art Unit: 3635

lip extending further from the inner-most surface than the normally-lower lip (Figure 8) and said normally-upper lip being approximate equal in height.

Claim 2:

The normally-upper lip extending at least about 10 percent further from the inner-most surface than the normally-lower lip (as best shown in Figure 8).

Claim 3:

The normally-upper lip extending at least about 20 percent further from the inner-most surface than the normally-lower lip (as best shown in Figure 8).

Claim 4:

The similarly configured sides are located on generally opposite sides of the body (Figure 8).

Claim 5:

The normally-upper lip presents a rounded distal portion (Figure 8).

Claim 7:

The normally-upper and normally-lower lips present opposing inwardly facing surfaces cooperatively defining at least a portion of the groove.

Claim 21:

Eberle III discloses a deck board comprising an elongated body presenting a pair of similarly configured sides, each of the sides including a normally-upper lip (61) and a normally-lower lip (63), each of the sides including a longitudinal groove (55) defined between the normally-upper lip and the normally-lower lip, the groove including an inner-most surface representing the deepest portion of the groove, the groove lacking a

Art Unit: 3635

recess operable to retain water, and the normally-upper lip extending further from the inner-most surface than the normally-lower lip (Figure 8).

Claim 22:

The groove and the lower lip lack protrusions extending away from the joists.

Claim 23:

The groove includes a bottom surface extending from the inner-most surface to the lower lip, the inner-most surface, bottom surface, and lower lip present a continuously downward slope.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11-14, 16-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by US Patent 5,660,016 to Erwin et al.

Claim 11:

Erwin et al. discloses a deck system comprising a plurality of laterally spaced joists (column 1, lines 24-26), a plurality of substantially parallel boards extending across and supporting joists, each of the boards including a pair of generally opposite similarly configured sides, each of the sides including an upper lip (70), a lower lip (74), and a groove (68) defined between the upper and lower lips, the lower lip being

Art Unit: 3635

disposed closer to the joists than the upper lip, the upper lip protruding further than the lower lip, and the groove lacking a recess operable to retain water.

Claim 12:

The groove includes an inner-most surface representing the deepest portion of the groove, the upper lip extending at least 10 percent further from the inner-most surface than the lower lip (Figure 1, column 4, lines 13-16).

Claim 13:

The groove includes an inner-most surface representing the deepest portion of the groove, the upper lip extending at least 20 percent further from the inner-most surface than the lower lip (Figure 1, column 4, lines 13-16). The upper lip appears to extend at least approximately 30% beyond the lower lip.

Claim 14:

Each of the boards is spaced from one another by 1/8 inch (column 7, lines 33-36).

Claim 16:

Each of the boards is formed via extrusion (column 4, line 22).

Claim 17:

The groove and lower lip lack protrusions extending away from the joists.

Claim 18:

The groove includes an inner-most surface representing the deepest portion of the groove and a bottom surface extending from the inner-most surface to the lower lip,

Art Unit: 3635

the inner-most surface, bottom surface, and lower lip present a continuously downward slope (74, Figure 1).

Claim 19:

As measured from the inner-most surface (72), the upper lip and lower lip are approximately equal in height.

Claim 20:

The groove lacks a recess operable to retain water.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2003/0123924 to Eberle, III. In view of Timber Tech (1998).

Claim 6:

While Eberle III discloses that the boards may be formed from materials selected from the group consisting of polymers, wood, and combination thereof (page 5, claim 10), Eberle III does not specify that the body is formed of fiber and plastic. However, fiber-plastic decking boards are well known in the art. Timber Tech discloses a

Art Unit: 3635

composite material of plastic and cellulosic fiber (page 1) for extrusion of custom profiled deck planks. In view of Timber Tech, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form Eberle III's deck boards with an extruded fiber-plastic composite for resistance to moisture, insects and the ability to receive finishing paints and stains, all benefits for outdoor decking.

Claim 10:

Claim 10 is considered product-by-process claim; therefore, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. See MPEP 2113. The patentability of the product does not depend on its method of production. If the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the same prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed.Cir.1985). In view of Timber Tech's extruded fiber-plastic deck boards, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to form Eberle III's fiber-plastic deck boards by extrusion.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2003/0123924 to Eberle, III.

Claims 8 and 9:

While Eberle III does not specify the dimensions of the groove or the board body, such dimensions are considered matters of obvious design choice, as dictated by the size of the deck, material properties of the board, and consumer preferences. 1-inch and 2-inch deck boards are notoriously well known in the art. Eberle III's groove is

Art Unit: 3635

approximately 1/3 the thickness of the deck board (Figure 8); therefore, Eberle III's groove would be .5 inches on a board 1-1/2 inches thick.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,660,016 to Erwin et al. in view of US Patent Application 2003/0101673 to West et al.

Claim 15:

While Erwin et al. discloses that the boards may be made of polyethylene (column 7, lines 20-25), Erwin et al. does not specify that the boards are formed of cellulose fiber and plastic material. However, cellulose fiber and plastic composite boards are well known in the art. West teaches a deck board comprised of wood fiber and polyethylene (paragraph 41). In view of West, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form Erwin et al.'s deck board with a cellulose fiber and plastic material for the stated benefit of improved durability (paragraph 41).

Final

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3635

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naoko Slack whose current telephone number is 571-272-6848. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (6:00 am-2:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl D. Friedman can be reached on 571-272-6842. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3635

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Naoko Slack
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3635

NS
February 21, 2006